

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 -14 are pending herein.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of original claim 3, claim 3 is correspondingly canceled, and claims 5 and 6 are amended to correct their claim dependencies. Thus, no new matter is added by this Amendment.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments merely incorporate allowable subject matter from original claim 3 and correct informalities); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 3, 5 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

To this end, Applicant amends claim 1 to include the subject matter of original claim 3. As acknowledged by the Patent Office, claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action made a rejection of at least one claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

The Office Action fails to specify which claim is rejected. Applicant requests clarification of the rejected claim.

The Office Action indicates that the rejection is based on the claims allegedly reciting that contact holes go through a conductor rather than an insulator. The Office Action further alleges, as best understood, that Applicant intended that the contact holes go through the insulator below the conductor. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the claims recite contact holes through a conductor. Applicant submits that this rejection was obviously made in error. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 06-289415 (hereinafter "Kitawada").

Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-194013 (hereinafter "Hoshino").

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, claim 1 is amended to incorporate allowable subject matter and is thus allowable. Claims 2 and 8-13 each depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable.

Claim 12 also depends from claim 1 and claim 14 depends from claim 4, which is not rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kitawada or Hoshino. Applicant assumes the Office Action was referring to claim 12 and not claim 14.

Nonetheless, as discussed more fully below, claim 14 is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Sukegawa in view of Inada

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,636,329 (hereinafter "Sukegawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,559 (hereinafter "Inada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons discussed above, claim 1 and claims 2 and 5-13, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 4, claim 4 recites, in part, an electro-optical device, comprising a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region.

The Patent Office acknowledged that Sukegawa fails to disclose the use of chip on glass devices, flexible circuits, or the opposite substrate with the electro-optical material in the middle. However, the Patent Office alleged that an opposite substrate and electro-optic material is inherent to any liquid crystal device, that chip on glass with the integrated circuit is well known, and thus it would have been obvious to employ an electronic component as claimed.

As was indicated in the Amendment filed on January 2, 2004, the Patent Office has failed to indicate how Inada could be combined with Sukegawa to teach the claimed invention.

Further, in any case, as also argued in the January 2 Amendment, the presently claimed invention can not be achieved by Sukegawa and Inada, alone or in combination. Specifically, nowhere do Sukegawa or Inada teach or suggest a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating

layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region, as recited in claim 4.

Instead, the transparent conductive film layer (ITO) of Inada is formed under the insulating layer. Because the ITO layer of Inada is farther from the terminal of the IC than in the present invention, it is more difficult to bring the ITO layer into contact with the terminal. Sukegawa fails to remedy this deficiency.

Again, the Patent Office has failed to respond to Applicant's arguments with respect to at least claim 4. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that Sukegawa or Inada, whether taken singularly or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claims 1, 2 and 4-14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

B. Hoshino in view of Inada

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoshino in view of Inada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons discussed above, claim 1 and claims 2 and 5-13, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claims 4 and 14, Applicant submits that nothing in Inada remedies the deficiencies of Hoshino discussed above. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Hoshino and Inada would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to a second wiring connected to the electronic component, the second wiring being formed over the surface of the insulating layer, and connected to the first wiring via a contact hole formed within the mounting region, as recited in claim 4.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Hoshino and Inada, whether taken singularly or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the

invention of claims 1, 2 and 4 -14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

V. Examiner's Arguments

The Examiner alleges at page 6 of the Office Action that the assertion of well known elements has not been challenged by Applicant and therefore have taken the status of admitted prior art. Applicant assumes the Examiner has made this statement in error. Specifically, no "well known elements" were alleged in the previous Office Action. If this is not the case, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specify exactly what "well known elements" are allegedly being taken as admitted prior art.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2 and 4-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/mlv

Date: June 30, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--